BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,764	12/29/2000	Sailesh Kottapalli	2207/10122	3475

7590 07/20/2004

Kenyon & Kenyon
Suite 600
333 W. San Carlos Street
San Jose, CA 95110-2711

EXAMINER	
HUISMAN, DAVID J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2183	

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/753,764	KOTTAPALLI, SAILESH
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David J. Huisman	2183

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 April 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 have been examined.

Papers Submitted

2. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Amendment as received on 6/21/2004.

Drawings

3. From Applicant's remarks in the submitted amendment, it appears as if the drawings have been amended. However, the examiner has not received these amended drawings. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that applicant resubmit the amended drawings in response to this Office Action. Any objections made in the previous Office Action will be maintained until the amended drawings are reviewed.

4. The drawings are objected to because of the following minor informalities: Regarding Fig.2 and Fig.3, and in response to applicant's remarks, the examiner is not requiring that the "hop-overs" be removed. The examiner instead suggests clarifying the drawings because some of the "hop-overs" appear to touch the respective parallel wires to their immediate left. For instance, the wires directly coupled to components 324 and 326 appear to touch at one point (near the top of MUX 320). This makes the drawings somewhat unclear. Removing the "hop-overs" would be one option, but the examiner also suggested adding in more space between the wires. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures

appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the providing step, replace "thread" with --threads--. Appropriate correction is required.

Previous Rejections

6. Applicant, through amendment, has overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections set forth in the previous Office Action. However, the prior art rejections are respectfully maintained, as applicant has failed to overcome them, because even if "the instruction pointers are, indeed, the same instruction pointers that are outputted by the multiplexers," as argued by applicant on page 13 of the remarks, the examiner asserts that AAPA still anticipates the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1 and 10 recite the limitation "said storage element" in the second to last line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because it is not clear whether applicant is referring to the first storage element, the second storage element, or both.

9. Claim 19 recites the limitation "said storage element" in the fifth to last line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because it is not clear whether applicant is referring to the first storage element, the second storage element, or both.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

11. Claims 1-4, 9-13, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (herein referred to as AAPA).

12. Referring to claim 1, AAPA has taught a simultaneous multithreaded processor system comprising:

a) a first multiplexer associated with instruction pointers of a first thread. See Fig.2, component 218.

b) a second multiplexer associated with instruction pointers of a second thread. See Fig.2, component 220.

c) said first and second multiplexers to provide said instruction pointers of said first and second threads for execution in said processor. See Fig.2 and note that MUXs 218 and 220 provide pointers to subsequent stages in the pipeline (which includes an execution stage 212).

d) first and second storage elements coupled to said respective first and second multiplexers (see Fig.2, components 248 and 250, for instance, and note that they are coupled to MUXs 218 and 220), wherein:

d1) one of the first and second threads is active while the other of said first and second threads is inactive. Note that MUX 246 only has one output. This will be either an instruction from a first thread or an instruction from a second thread. The thread that is selected will be active; the other will be inactive.

d2) said instruction pointers for the active thread are delivered to processor logic and the instruction pointers for the inactive thread are delivered to said storage element for delivery to the processor logic when the inactive thread becomes the active thread. If the first thread is active, then the output of MUX 218 will be selected for output by MUX 246 and proceed to processor logic in additional pipeline stages. Furthermore, as disclosed on page 2, lines 21-23, of applicant's background, the storage elements are used to store instruction pointers for the inactive thread. And clearly, if the instruction pointers are stored within the storage element(s), then the instructions must have been delivered to the storage elements by the re-steer logic. The storage elements are then able

to provide these instruction pointers to the MUX 220, which would output the instructions to processor logic when the second thread becomes active.

13. Referring to claim 2, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 1. AAPA has further taught a common multiplexer coupled between said first and second multiplexer and processor logic. See Fig.2, component 246.

14. Referring to claim 3, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 2. AAPA has further taught that the common multiplexer receives instruction pointer data sequentially from the first multiplexer and the second multiplexer by utilizing a time-multiplexing protocol. See page 2, lines 17-19, of applicant's specification (background information section).

15. Referring to claim 4, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 3. AAPA has further taught that the time-multiplexing protocol is a `round-robin` protocol. See page 2, lines 17-19, of applicant's specification (background information section).

16. Referring to claim 9, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 1. AAPA has further taught that the storage element is a flip-flop device. See page 2, line 21.

17. Referring to claim 10, AAPA has taught a method for a simultaneous multithreaded processor system, comprising the steps of:

a) associating a first multiplexer with instruction pointers of a first thread. See Fig.2, component 218.

b) associating a second multiplexer with instruction pointers of a second thread. See Fig.2, component 220.

c) providing, by said first and second multiplexers, said instruction pointers of said first and second threads for execution in said processor. See Fig.2 and note that MUXs 218 and 220 provide pointers to subsequent stages in the pipeline (which includes an execution stage 212).

d) coupling first and second storage elements to said respective first and second multiplexers. see Fig.2, components 248 and 250, for instance, and note that they are coupled to MUXs 218 and 220

e) establishing one of the first and second threads as active and the other of said first and second threads as inactive. Note that MUX 246 only has one output. This will be either an instruction from a first thread or an instruction from a second thread. The thread that is selected will be active; the other will be inactive.

f) delivering said instruction pointers for the active thread to processor logic and delivering said instruction pointers for the inactive thread to said storage element for delivery to the processor logic when the inactive thread becomes the active thread. If the first thread is active, then the output of MUX 218 will be selected for output by MUX 246 and proceed to processor logic in additional pipeline stages. Furthermore, as disclosed on page 2, lines 21-23, of applicant's background, the storage elements are used to store instruction pointers for the inactive thread. And clearly, if the instruction pointers are stored within the storage element(s), then the instructions must have been delivered to the storage elements by the re-steer logic. The storage elements are then able to provide these instruction pointers to the MUX 220, which would output the instructions to processor logic when the second thread becomes active.

18. Referring to claim 11, AAPA has taught a method as described in claim 10. Furthermore, the system of claim 2 performs the method of claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2 above.

19. Referring to claim 12, AAPA has taught a method as described in claim 11. Furthermore, the system of claim 3 performs the method of claim 12. Therefore, claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3 above.

20. Referring to claim 13, AAPA has taught a method as described in claim 12. Furthermore, the system of claim 4 performs the method of claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4 above.

21. Referring to claim 18, AAPA has taught a method as described in claim 10. Furthermore, the system of claim 9 performs the method of claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 9 above.

22. Referring to claim 19, AAPA has taught a simultaneous multithreaded processor system comprising:

a) a first multiplexer associated with instruction pointers of a first thread. See Fig.2, component 218.

b) a second multiplexer associated with instruction pointers of a second thread. See Fig.2, component 220.

c) said first and second multiplexers to provide said instruction pointers of said first and second threads for execution in said processor. See Fig.2 and note that MUXs 218 and 220 provide pointers to subsequent stages in the pipeline (which includes an execution stage 212).

d) first and second storage elements coupled to said respective first and second multiplexers (see Fig.2, components 248 and 250, for instance, and note that they are coupled to MUXs 218 and 220), wherein:

d1) one of the first and second threads is active while the other of said first and second threads is inactive. Note that MUX 246 only has one output. This will be either an instruction from a first thread or an instruction from a second thread. The thread that is selected will be active; the other will be inactive.

d2) said instruction pointers for the active thread are delivered to processor logic and said instruction pointers for the inactive thread are delivered to said storage element for delivery to the processor logic when the inactive thread becomes the active thread. If the first thread is active, then the output of MUX 218 will be selected for output by MUX 246 and proceed to processor logic in additional pipeline stages. Furthermore, as disclosed on page 2, lines 21-23, of applicant's background, the storage elements are used to store instruction pointers for the inactive thread. And clearly, if the instruction pointers are stored within the storage element(s), then the instructions must have been delivered to the storage elements by the re-steer logic. The storage elements are then able to provide these instruction pointers to the MUX 220, which would output the instructions to processor logic when the second thread becomes active.

d3) and a common multiplexer coupled between said first and second multiplexer and processor logic that receives instruction pointer data sequentially from the first multiplexer and the second multiplexer by utilizing a time-multiplexing protocol. See

Fig.2, component 246, and see page 2, lines 17-19, of applicant's specification (background information section).

23. Referring to claim 20, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 19. AAPA has further taught that the first multiplexer and the second multiplexer receive instruction pointer information and data from a plurality of stages in a processor pipeline. See Fig.2, and note that MUXs 218 and 220 receive pointer information and data from various pipeline stages, including the IPG-1, IPG+1, IPG+2, and CMT stages.

24. Referring to claim 21, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 20. AAPA has further taught that the first multiplexer and the second multiplexer receive instruction pointer information and data from re-steer logic at the plurality of stages in the processor pipeline. See Fig.2, and note that the information is received from re-steer logic located in a plurality of pipeline stages (the re-steer logic includes the boxes labeled 1-6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

25. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

26. Claims 5-8, 14-17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA, as applied above.

27. Referring to claim 5, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 1. Although AAPA's Fig.2 utilizes time-multiplexing between two threads (page 2, lines 17-19), AAPA has

not explicitly taught that the first multiplexer and the second multiplexer are priority multiplexers. However, AAPA also shows that priority multiplexers are known in the art. See Fig.1. In addition, from page 2, lines 6-9 of applicant's specification, it has been taught that a thread may be switched if a higher priority thread needs attention. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the first and second multiplexers of Fig.2 to be priority multiplexers so that more important threads, having highest priority, are executed as soon as possible.

28. Referring to claim 6, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 5. AAPA has further taught that the first multiplexer and the second multiplexer receive instruction pointer information and data from a plurality of stages in a processor pipeline. See Fig.2, and note that MUXs 218 and 220 receive pointer information and data from various pipeline stages, including the IPG-1, IPG+1, IPG+2, and CMT stages.

29. Referring to claim 7, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 6. AAPA has further taught that the first multiplexer and the second multiplexer receive instruction pointer information and data from re-steer logic at the plurality of stages in the processor pipeline. See Fig.2, and note that the information is received from re-steer logic located in a plurality of pipeline stages (the re-steer logic includes the boxes labeled 1-6).

30. Referring to claim 8, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 7. AAPA has not explicitly taught that the first and second multiplexers (of Fig.2) pass the instruction pointer information and data to the common multiplexer with a pre-determined priority. However, AAPA has taught the concept of a multiplexer which passes instruction pointer information and data with a pre-determined priority. See Fig.1, and page 4, line 16, to page 5, line 9, of

applicant's specification. Such a multiplexer allows for switching threads such that the highest priority thread receives immediate attention. See page 2, lines 6-9 of applicant's specification. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Fig.2 of AAPA such that the first and second multiplexers (of Fig.2) pass the instruction pointer information and data to the common multiplexer with a pre-determined priority so that more important threads, having highest priority, are executed as soon as possible.

31. Referring to claim 14, AAPA has taught a method as described in claim 10. Furthermore, the system of claim 5 performs the method of claim 14. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5 above.

32. Referring to claim 15, AAPA has taught a method as described in claim 14. Furthermore, the system of claim 6 performs the method of claim 15. Therefore, claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6 above.

33. Referring to claim 16, AAPA has taught a method as described in claim 15. Furthermore, the system of claim 7 performs the method of claim 16. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7 above.

34. Referring to claim 17, AAPA has taught a method as described in claim 16. Furthermore, the system of claim 8 performs the method of claim 17. Therefore, claim 17 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 8 above.

35. Referring to claim 22, AAPA has taught a system as described in claim 19. AAPA has not explicitly taught that the first and second multiplexers (of Fig.2) pass the instruction pointer information and data to the common multiplexer with a pre-determined priority. However, AAPA has taught the concept of a multiplexer which passes instruction pointer information and

data with a pre-determined priority. See Fig.1, and page 4, line 16, to page 5, line 9, of applicant's specification. Such a multiplexer allows for switching threads such that the highest priority thread receives immediate attention. See page 2, lines 6-9 of applicant's specification. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Fig.2 of AAPA such that the first and second multiplexers (of Fig.2) pass the instruction pointer information and data to the common multiplexer with a pre-determined priority so that more important threads, having highest priority, are executed as soon as possible.

Conclusion

36. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Huisman whose telephone number is (703) 305-7811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan can be reached on (703) 305-9712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DJH
David J. Huisman
July 15, 2004

EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100